

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/810,159		WU ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	ASAD M. NAWAZ		2455	

All Participants:

(1) ASAD M. NAWAZ.

(2) Roberto Devoto (Reg No 55,108).

Date of Interview: 2 September 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

101, withdrawn claims, potential art rejections

Claims discussed:

1, 22-25, 27-36, 44

Prior art documents discussed:

Okuyama et al (USPAT 7,437,413) Issacs et al (USPAT 7043530)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: multiple

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner initiated interview to attempt to place the application in condition for allowance by proposing minor changes to some claims. Outstanding rejections were discussed along with a potential prior art rejection. Outstanding rejections include those under 35 USC 101. The Examiner and applicant discussed why claims 22-25 were non-statutory and how to fix the claims in the future. The examiner invites the applicants to call anytime if any confusions regarding the 35 USC 101 statutes arises. Prior restriction requirements set forth by another examiner were discussed. It appears from the record that the claims were withdrawn from consideration and non-elected without traverse. Resolutions to this and other issues were discussed. No agreement was reached on the proposed amendments..